

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-5, 12-14, 28 and 32 have been amended. Claims 7-11, 15-27 and 29-31 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 33-37 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, 12-14, 28 and 32-37 are now presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the objections raised by the Examiner in the last Office Action (mailed, October 19, 2004).

Applicant respectfully submits Narayan discloses “translating text in a computer system to synthesized speech; and more particularly to techniques used in such systems for storage and retrieval of speech data” (col. 1, lines 20-23). Although Narayan discloses a “*text-to-speech system*” it does not disclose or reasonably suggest “accessing diphone waveforms, derived residuals, and Linear Predictive Coding (LPC) coefficients . . . [and] compressing the diphone waveforms into compressed diphones” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis provided). In other words, although the diphone waveforms, derived residuals, LPC coefficients are accessed, just the diphone waveforms are compressed into compressed diphones, as recited by claim 1. Further, Narayan does not disclose or reasonably suggest storing the compressed diphones, the derived residuals, and the LPC coefficients into a single compressed packet, which can be accessed later to locate and extract one or more requested diphones, as recited by claim 1.

None of the limitations of claim 1 missing from Narayan are disclosed or reasonably suggested in Kochanski. For example, like Narayan, Kochanski does not disclose or reasonably suggest accessing diphone waveforms, derived residuals, and

Linear Predictive Coding (LPC) coefficients, compressing the diphone waveforms into compressed diphones, or storing the compressed diphones, the derived residuals, and the LPC coefficients into a single compressed packet, as recited by claim 1. Hence, at least with reference to claim 1, Kochanski adds nothing relevant to Narayan. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 and its dependent claims are distinguished over the cited references.

Independent claims 12 and 33 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1 and accordingly, claims 12 and 33 and their dependent claims are distinguished over the cited references.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for a One-Month Extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: February 18, 2005


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980